Codebook: tPP Threats and Harassment Study v3.0

Citation

Michael Loadenthal, Grant Van Robays, Jamie Noulty, and Carter Langham, "Codebook: tPP Threats and Harassment Study," Unpublished, 2026.

Format

1. **Variable Name:** What question the variable is asking [Variable Type]
    a. Value 1
    b. Value 2
    c. …

Table of Contents

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria **2**
Means of Threat: **3**
Method of Threat: **6**
Target Threat: **11**
Other: **12**
tPP's standard Variables: **12**
Appendix **41**

Sample description: *Final N = 336 felony, ideologically-affiliated, criminal cases wherein the dominant criminal method is 'threats or harassment', and for whom the defendant was indicted (or the event occurred) 1/1/2015-12/31/2025.*

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Including:

1. Threat and harassment must include a discrete communication platform/delivery medium, including digital/electronic platforms (e.g., social media, SMS), and non-electronic platforms (e.g., postal mail, legal filing).
2. From any of the following tabs:
    a. Completed Case Starters
    b. Capitol protest cases
    c. Summer-fall 2020 protest cases
    d. Pending cases
    e. FOUO
3. Jurisdiction = federal
4. criminal method = threat/harassment
5. ideological affiliation = anything other than no affiliation/not a factor or unclear
6. Date 01/01/2015-12/31/2025
7. Availability of an evidentiary document that contains narrative details, ***including*** some details of the threat's content
    a. Try RECAP first
    b. If unsuccessful, ask Dr. Loadenthal for PACER file
    c. If neither is available → exclude

Excluding:

1. Threat and harassment are only offline, on the ground (e.g., yelling at someone in their car)
2. Reason for inclusion = state speech only
3. ideological affiliation = no affiliation/not a factor or unclear
4. Cases before 2015
5. Non-federal cases
6. Cases in which a sufficient evidentiary document is unavailable or inaccessible
7. Threat/harassment as a secondary criminal method

Source Document Process

1. Using the Case ID, see what documents are available in the Team Drive.
2. Attempt to locate court documents (e.g., Criminal Complaint, Indictment, Information, affidavits, memorandums, motions) which contain a narrative account of the crime *and* details on the content of the threats issued.
3. If sufficient documents are not available, try to retrieve them via RECAP.
4. If documents are not available, start a PACER request.
5. If no suitable narrative-rich court document is available, the case is excluded.

Means of Threat:

1) **PrimaryMeans**: Through what manner of communication did the defendant **primarily**[1] convey the threat/harassment to their intended target?[2] [Categorical]
    a) Postal[3]
    b) Email
    c) Legal filings or other administrative/official filings
    d) Phone[4]
    e) SMS[5]
    f) Contact Portal/Reporting System[6]
    g) Facebook
    h) Twitter/X
    i) Instagram
    j) TikTok
    k) Snapchat
    l) YouTube/Vimeo
    m) Discord/Twitch/Steam
    n) Reddit
    o) 4chan/8chan[7]
    p) Gab
    q) Kik
    r) VK

---

[1] By 'primary' we mean, the most frequently used or mentioned in the charging document. This is to be understood as the preferred means of threat/harassment by the defendant. For example, if a defendant uses Twitter/X to share a video hosted on YouTube, we understand the primary means to be Twitter/x as this is the preferred platform used.

[2] Note that the " target" in this context refers to the entity the defendant **intends** to threaten/harass with their communication activity. This may be different from the direct **recipient** of the communication. For example, if a defendant left a comment on a local news media outlet's website threatening to kill the President of the United States, the target would be the President, even though the recipient was a local news organization. In the context of this and subsequent variables, "target" should be understood as the audience the defendant intended to threaten/harass with their communication.

[3] Inclusive of USPS, UPS, FedEx, DHL.

[4] This would include commonly used Voice Over IP products such as Google Voice, and leaving messages on answering machines.

[5] Inclusive of WhatsApp or other SMS-based applications.

[6] This code includes the use of an online 'contact us' or complaint/report portal to threaten/harass. This would include cases in which a defendant uses an online platform, often those accessible through a target entity's website or bespoke app, to carry out threat/harassment behavior. Examples include instances whereby a defendant leaves a threatening message on a target's 'Contact Us' page of their website (or other feature of target's website allowing for direct messaging), uses a target's reporting/complaint systems, or uses a target's bespoke customer service platforms for threat/harassment. Note that for this to be coded, the defendant must have accessed the contact portal directly; calling, texting a phone number, or emailing directly would not be appropriate. If, however, evidence suggests a defendant accessed an online system like PorlandOnline (see case 04222021_KRT), used bespoke platforms like SeeClickFix to leave threatening messages, or filed complaints meant to threaten/harass on platforms like a state attorney general's online complaint and/or whistleblower system, this value would be coded.

[7] Inclusive of other, similar image boards.

s) Telegram
t) Bitchute
u) Parler
v) LinkedIn
w) Truth Social
x) Other social media
y) Unclear/unnamed
z) Other non-digital platform
aa) Multiple: no clear primary
bb) N/A (no digital platforms used)

2) **MultipleMeans**: Did the defendant use more than one means of communication to threaten or harass the intended target (e.g., defendant sent a threatening email AND made a phone call; posted a threat on Facebook AND sent a letter)? [Binary]
   a) Yes
   b) No[8]
3) **DigitalPlatforms**: What digital platforms are mentioned in the evidentiary record that the defendant used or actively engaged in, even if they were not used for threats and harassment? [Multi-Select Categorical]
   a) Email[9]
   b) Phone[10]
   c) SMS[11]
   d) Direct contact portal/messaging system
   e) Facebook
   f) Twitter/X
   g) Instagram
   h) TikTok
   i) Snapchat
   j) YouTube/Vimeo
   k) Discord/Twitch/Steam
   l) Reddit
   m) 4chan/8chan
   n) LinkedIn
   o) Telegram
   p) Kik
   q) VK
   r) Gab

[8] Without clear, demonstrable evidence that more than a single means of threat/harassment communication was used, the variable should be coded with the value of 'no'.
[9] This would be inclusive of common general use email systems like Google/Gmail, Outlook, Yahoo Mail, AOL, business/professional email services, and security-focused emails like Protonmail.
[10] This would include commonly used Voice Over IP products such as Google Voice, and leaving messages on answering machines.
[11] Inclusive of WhatsApp or other SMS-based applications.

s) Bitchute
t) Parler
u) Truth Social
v) Other social media
w) Unnamed/unclear
x) Not Applicable[12]

4) **PublicPrivate**: What was the platform channel type the defendant used specifically to threaten or harass the intended target? [Categorical]
   a) Public Only[13]
   b) Private Only[14]
   c) Public and Private[15]
   d) Unclear
5) **PlatformAffordances**: What specific functions or features of the digital platform did the defendant use *in the course of criminality*[16] (i.e., to communicate the threat or harassment, conceal actions, hide evidence, etc.)? [Multi-Select Categorical]
   a) Public Posts[17]
   b) Private/Direct Messages[18]
   c) Tagging[19]
   d) Short-form Content[20]
   e) Long-form Content[21]

---

[12] This variable asks about the defendant's broader digital footprint and pertains only to platforms where the defendant maintained an active presence or utilized for communication. If no *digital* platforms are mentioned in the evidentiary materials, code 'Not Applicable.' 'Not Applicable' would include cases in which the only type of platform used is postal mail or paper-based legal filings lacking a digital component, as these are not digital forms of communication.
[13] Threatening/harassing content was delivered exclusively via public-facing channels intended for a mass, non-specific audience (e.g., public social media feeds, open message boards/forums, comment sections). This would include posts a defendant makes in reply to a post from a target or other third-party, as these posts are publicly viewable despite being posted in direct response to the post of another. This would include replies to specific individuals/channels/groups, which are displayed publicly.
[14] Threatening/harassing content was delivered exclusively via channels restricted to the target (e.g., social media direct messages, private mail/ email, phone/text message, closed chat room).
[15] Defendant used both public *and* private channels to threaten or harass the target.
[16] As this variable pertains to activity over the course of the defendant's criminality, conduct need not be confined to the issuance of a threat/harassment communication. Actions taken to conceal the criminal threat/harassment behavior can also be included.
[17] Includes content posted directly on the defendant's feed, a public forum, or the general timeline of a platform and is intended for maximum, non-specific visibility (e.g., Facebook posts, Tweets, YouTube comments). This would include posts a defendant makes in reply to a post from a target or other third-party, as these posts are publicly viewable despite being posted in direct response to the post of another. This would include replies to specific individuals/channels/groups, which are displayed publicly.
[18] Includes communication via a private, one-to-one channel (e.g., DMs, direct email, private messaging including phone and text).
[19] Includes use of specific platform mechanics/features (e.g., the "@" function, hashtags, other tagging features unique to the platform) to draw attention to the threatening/harassing content.
[20] Includes creation of threat/harassment content designed to disappear quickly (e.g., stories, reels.
[21] Includes creation of threat/harassment content designed for narrative depth and detail, moving beyond short-term content that is meant to be fleeting and instead is intended for permanence (e.g., written manifesto, written long-form articles/blog post, video content generation). Long-form content would not

f) Live Chat-Stream[22]
g) Group Features[23]
h) Hyperlink/Cross-Platform[24]
i) Not Applicable[25]

6) **Encrypted tech**: Did the defendant utilize any end-to-end or otherwise encrypted technologies *in the course of their criminality* (e.g., to contact their target, organize their crime, etc.)?[26] [Binary]
   a) Yes[27]
   b) No[28]

Method of Threat:

7) **IdentityConcealment**: Do the defendant's actions serve to conceal their identity? [Categorical]
   a) Yes[29]
   b) No[30]

include posting pictures or memes. Though these are meant for permanence and are not short-form/disappearing, they are not designed for narrative or textual depth, detail, or duration sufficient for this code.

[22] Includes threat/harassment communication conducted in a live, synchronous setting (e.g., video/game streaming chat/livestream, comment on a live video broadcast, post in live Q&A/chat box).

[23] Includes threat/harassment communication within closed groups, private chat rooms, message boards, or dedicated forums (e.g., Discord servers, Telegram channels, private Facebook Groups).

[24] Includes platform mechanics designed to *share* threat/harassment content across platforms or drive traffic away from the original platform (e.g., posting a link to a threatening post, video, or manifesto, cross-posting the same content to multiple distinct platforms, other URL-sharing in the course of criminality).

[25] Includes when no digital platforms were used, for example, in the case where threats are only conveyed via postal mail.

[26] This would be coded as "yes" if the encrypted tech/app is mentioned anywhere in the evidentiary record regardless of how the product was used (e.g., not used to threaten/harass). This would also include 'password protecting' or 'encrypting' items on a defendant's computer.

[27] This would include mention of any security-focused messaging, email, or cloud products including but not limited to Signal, Wire, Discord, WhatsApp, WeChat, Viber, Threema, Briar, Telegram, Kick, Session, Element, ProtonMail, Tutanota mail, PGP, Tresorit, Sync.com, Element, Wickr.

[28] Without clear, demonstrable evidence of encrypted tech use, this would be coded as 'no'.

[29] In making their threat or harassment, the defendant uses a non-identifiable user name (i.e., not their actual name), voice modulator, 'burner phone', or other means to obfuscate identity. This would include use of platform mechanics to create digital accounts under different names in an effort to conceal behavior or identity. For example, if the evidentiary record suggests a defendant created multiple social media or email accounts under names that do not include any identifiable information in an effort to conceal their identity when engaging in their criminal threat/harassment activity, this value would be coded.

[30] In making their threat or harassment, the defendant does **not** attempt to conceal their identity (e.g., username matches legal name, calls from home/cellphone, leaves name or other personally-identifiable information such as phone number or address.) In some cases, where a defendant calls from their home/cellphone, but provides a false name, this would be coded as **Yes**. If a defendant calls from their home/cellphone and/or leaves their name, this would be coded as **No.**

c) Unclear[31]

8) **Frequency:** What was the overall frequency of the defendant's threatening/harassing communication/contact toward the target?[32] [Ordinal]
   a) **Low (#1)**: One or two distinct communication events consisting of a single session of activity initiated by the defendant (i.e., email, text message, social media post, etc.) directed at the intended target with no follow-up.[33]
   b) **Medium (#2)**: More than two distinct communication events but less than 5 (i.e., 3-5).
   c) **Frequent (#3)**: More than 5 distinct communication events (high-frequency, high-volume threat/harassment behavior).

9) **RacialEthnicThreat**: Does the threatening or harassing content contain racialized-ethnicized elements (e.g., slurs, racial stereotypes, Islamophobia, accusations of racism/ethnocentrism)? [Binary]
   a) Yes[34]
   b) No[35]

10) **ImmigrationThreat**: Does the threatening or harassing content contain elements related to immigration status/documentation, citizenship/nativity, deportation, national borders, 'build the wall', 'ICE'-related, etc.? [Binary]
   a) Yes

---

[31] Includes cases in which evidentiary materials do not provide sufficient detail or redact information typically used to determine if a defendant attempted to obfuscate or conceal their identity, such as account usernames.

[32] Within this variable, a 'communication event' is meant to indicate a limited, specific time-space period (i.e., one 'sit down' to threaten) wherein all of the defendant's actions occur in succession. ***Note:*** A *change in platform* would constitute a new communication event even in actions occurring in quick succession. For example, if a defendant sends a threat over text and then sends a threat over email, this would be considered two distinct communication events due to the switching of platform channels used to communicate the threat.

[33] Throughout this variable the focus is on a 'threat/harassment event' – a distinct period wherein the defendant commits a crime. A case could still be marked as "low" if during 1-2 events, a defendant sends threats to multiple recipients at once (e.g., sending 2 emails, each to 100 recipients = "low"). A case would still be marked as "low" if a defendant makes multiple separate posts or comments (*even 2 or more individual posts)* in rapid succession within the context of making a threatening communication, as the threatening conduct occurred within one distinct session of activity. For example, if evidentiary materials indicate that a defendant posted an image on Twitter/X and replies to it with a post tagging the target and another reply detailing a specific threat, all in the same thread, this would constitute a single communication event and be coded as "low." For a visual example, see the communication event example in the appendix.

[34] As an ethnoreligious group, this would also include anti-Jewish/antisemitic hatred.

[35] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., the presence of a racial slur or mention of a racialized characterization), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.' ***Note:*** This variable and all subsequent "Threat Content" variables pertain to elements of the threat that is communicated in the criminal case of the defendant, *not* the ideology of the defendant. If evidence suggests a defendant held anti-Black views but the content of the threat/harassment content did not include any anti-Black or racial elements, coders would code this as 'no'.

b) No[36]

11) ReligiousThreat: Does the threatening or harassing content contain religious elements (e.g., slurs, 'bitch', stereotypes), inclusive of anti-Muslim, anti-Jewish, anti-Christian rhetoric, as well as using religion as a justification for threats/harassment? [Binary]

a) Yes
b) No[37]

12) GenderedThreat: Does the threatening or harassing content contain gendered elements (e.g., slurs, gendered stereotypes), inclusive of homophobic, misogynistic, transphobic, or otherwise sexual/gender-orientated threats? [Binary]

a) Yes
b) No[38]

13) ViolentThreat: Does the threatening or harassing content contain violent elements (e.g., descriptions of gore, physical violence, injury, torture, mutilation, death)? [Binary]

a) Yes
b) No[39]

14) SexualViolentThreat: Does the threatening or harassing content contain sexual violent elements (e.g., threats of rape or sexual assault)? [Binary]

a) Yes
b) No[40]

15) PersonalThreat: Does the threatening or harassing content contain explicit <u>evidence of a personal grievance involving a profound sense of, or fixation on, a *perceived* injustice in</u>

[36] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., the presence of an anti-immigrant/nativist slur, stereotype or mention/threat of deportation), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.' ***<u>Note</u>***: Simple mentions of nationalist language, "patriotism," or general "America First" rhetoric are insufficient on their own to code as 'Yes' unless used in the context of other anti-immigration elements.

[37] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., the presence of anti-religious slurs, stereotypes, anti-religious/antisemitic conspiracy theories, or language justifying the threat/harassment with religious beliefs), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.'

[38] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., the presence of a gendered slur or mention of a gendered characterization), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.' A threat that is directed at an individual of a certain gender is *<u>not</u>* sufficient for coding 'yes' without evidence of gendered elements or slurs in the context of making the threat. For instance, a threat consisting of the statement "Nancy Pelosi is next on my list" would *<u>not</u>* constitute a gendered threat despite the target being a woman. Note that cases in which the defendant uses terms like 'bitch' or 'cunt', which may sometimes be used more generally or as slang devoid of gendered malicious meaning, are not coded as GenderedThreat=Yes *<u>unless</u>* used as a slur to imply harm against women. For example, a threat like "[Target X] is a bitch" would be coded GenderedThreat=Yes, but something like "You bitches can eat my bullets" directed at a non-gendered target like police officers would be coded as GenderedThreat=No.

[39] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., explicit mention of a violent act or intention, death, killing, etc.), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.'

[40] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., explicit mention of a sexually violent act or intention such as rape or assault), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.'

the defendant's **personal life** resulting in the defendant's desire to right a wrong via threat/harassment? (e.g., grievance is explicitly linked to the defendant's private life or a prior relationship with the target, the threat is directly related to a conflict from the defendant's personal life or private history with the target, defendant blames the target for a specific personal loss or *perceived* slight that is unrelated to the defendant's broader ideology or not purely ideological in nature) [Binary]?

a) Yes[41]
b) No[42]

16) **SpecificThreat**: Does the threatening or harassing content include detailed and *specific information as to when/how* the threat will be carried out?[43] (e.g., 'I'll get you tomorrow,' 'I will stab you.') [Binary]

a) Yes
b) No[44]

17) **WeaponThreat**: What type(s) of weapon did the defendant threaten the use of in their threat/harassment communications, if applicable?[45] [Multi-Select Categorical]

a) Physical[46]
b) Firearm[47]
c) Bladed[48]

---

[41] Includes instances when the defendant articulates a perceived "wrong" they believe the target of their threat/harassment activity has committed against them personally, which they intend to "right" through their threat/harassment. Cases coded as 'yes' include cases where the defendant blames the target for a personal misfortune or when the threat is directly related to a previous encounter/relationship with the target. For example, if a defendant sends a letter to a judge threatening their life because of how they ruled in the defendant's case, this would be coded as 'yes'. In this case, the threatener *feels* that they are negatively affected by this issue/grievance.

[42] **Without** clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., explicit mention of a specific, unique conflict or grievance from the defendant's private life, professional relationship, prior contact with the target, or relating social problems to personalized consequences), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.' Threats directed at a politician or other target ***only*** because of their public actions, policies, or ideology would ***not*** be considered as personal, even if the defendant uses "you" in communications. These threats (i.e, "I will kill you for voting for this communist policy") ***only*** *reflect the defendant's ideological grievances* instead of personal grievances and are not the focus of this variable. If the threat was "I will kill you for voting for this communist policy that cost me my job", this variable would be coded as 'Yes'; while this threat is ideological, it is also rooted in the defendant's personal life/situation.

[43] If the threat simply said, 'I'll get you' this would ***not*** be considered specific as to ***when***. Similarly, 'I'll kill you' would ***not*** be considered specific as to ***how***. This variable should be coded as 'yes' if any of the threats meet this criteria, thus if there is one 'specific threat' and 100 non-specific, it should be coded as 'yes.'

[44] Without clear, demonstrable evidence (e.g., mention of a specific act or timing), the variable should be coded with the value of 'no.'

[45] This can be communicated through explicit naming of weapons, implied by action (e.g., 'Put lead between your eyes' = firearms), or via emoji (e.g., bomb emoji = explosives).

[46] (e.g., punch, kick, strangle, gouge, break [bone/limb], cannibalism).

[47] (e.g., handgun, rifle, shotgun, '2nd Amendment').

[48] (e.g., knife, axe, woodchipper).

d) Blunt impact[49]
e) Incendiary[50]
f) Explosive[51]
g) Chemical/biological/nuclear[52]
h) Rope/noose[53]
i) Vehicle[54]
j) Cyber/technological[55]
k) Unspecified[56]
l) Not Applicable[57]

18) OfflineApproach: Did the defendant attempt or carry out threatening and harassing behavior towards the target in the physical world?[58] [Multi-Select Categorical]

a) Yes: Stalking/surveillance[59]
b) Yes: Property damage[60]
c) Yes: Non-violent contact[61]

---

[49] (e.g., hammer, rock, 'smash', whip).
[50] (e.g., arson, molotov cocktail, 'burn', 'torch'). If a defendant implies a specific act–e.g., 'blow up', 'burn down'--but does not specify a weapon type, the weapon can be presumed from the action. For example, someone threatening to 'shoot up' a site can be said to be threatening a 'Firearm' crime, while someone promising to 'smash' someone/thing can be said to be threatening a 'Blunt impact weapon.'
[51] (e.g., bombing, 'blow up, 'detonate, 'explode', car bomb)
[52] (e.g., chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear device, bacteria, poison, virus, 'COVID', 'anthrax', 'gas chamber', bodily fluids)
[53] (e.g., 'hang', 'lynch', strangle by wire)
[54] (e.g., use of a car, truck, or other vehicle to ram, run over, or strike the target)
[55] (e.g., use of high-tech means to sabotage critical infrastructure, DDOS attacks, hacking, doxxing, swatting). This code is used only when the cyber/technological means are threatened as a means to cause harm; it is ***not*** meant to be used as a descriptor of how the threat was communicated.
[56] If a defendant makes a clear threat of violence but does not specify a weapon, code as "Unspecified." These cases include those in which the defendant makes threats of physical violence without specifying (e.g., "I will get you," "I will kill you"). **When this value is selected, there should be no additional other WeaponThreat values.**
[57] Code "Not Applicable" when the threat/harassment communication contained no references to weapons or violence inflicted upon the target. This includes content that featured verbal abuse/intimidation, threats of political/reputational harm, or other non-violent harm.
[58] Note that this variable pertains only to threat/harassment activity and would not include behaviors mentioned in the evidentiary record as context or background information on the defendant. If evidentiary materials mention that a defendant had a physically violent confrontation with a target in the physical world that preceded defendant's threat/harassment conduct, it would not be appropriate to code 'Violent Contact', as this contact did not occur within the context of an act of criminal threat/harassment.
[59] Code this value if the defendant engaged in persistent, non-confrontational physical actions such as showing up at the target's workplace or residence, following the target, or maintaining surveillance on the target at a distance. Evidence should suggest that the defendant was in actual physical proximity to the target for this to be coded.
[60] Code if the defendant was physically present at the same physical location of the target (e.g., their residence, workplace, place of worship) and damaged, defaced, or sabotaged the target's property without making direct contact with the target.
[61] Code if the defendant attempted or made physical, face-to-face contact with the target *in the offline, physical world*, but the interaction did not involve or immediately lead to physical violence (e.g., verbal confrontation, shouting threats).

d) Yes: Violent contact[62]
e) Yes: *Attempted/planned*[63]
f) Not Applicable: Online only[64]

Target Threat:

19) MultipleTarget: Does the defendant intend to target *multiple* distinct entities with their threat/harassment activity? (e.g., multiple distinct persons, locations, demographics, organizations, movements). [Binary]
   a) Yes[65]
   b) No (threat is directed at a single identifiable target entity or broad, unspecified group)

20) SpecificTarget: Does the defendant intend to target a specific, identifiable entity with their threat/harassment? (i.e., threat/harassment explicitly names and targets an identifiable person, location, or organization, such as "I am going to kill Senator Jane Doe"; "I am going to blow up Anytown PD building"). [Binary]
   a) Yes[66]

---

[62] Code if the defendant engaged in or attempted physical violence against the target in the *offline, physical world* (e.g., assault, battery, attempted murder, physical harm).
[63] Planned but not accomplished (i.e., **no** offline contact w/ target). This would include cases in which evidentiary records show steps taken to take their threat/harassment offline (e.g., researched targets' addresses, generate target demographic location, researched methods for how to carry out attack or acquire weapons, other research/planning actions), but the defendant failed to take their actions offline. Coders should only use this code if evidence suggests the defendant engaged in preparatory actions (i.e., 'Acts in Furtherance Of'), not just threatened that they did. If a defendant claimed to have found out where a target lives or acquired weapons to inflict harm, but the evidentiary record does not support these claims, this would not be sufficient to use this code. Note that mere possession or legal ownership of firearms, absent evidence linking the weapons to a concrete plan of attack, is insufficient to meet this criteria, as there must be evidence of an overt act that corroborates the criminal intent expressed in the digital environment.
[64] When the threat/harassment was exclusively conveyed via digital means (online posts, email, phone, text, etc.) or postal mail, code 'Not Applicable'.
[65] More than a single distinct person, location, demographic, organization, or movement is targeted by threat/harassment activity. Coded 'yes' if, for example, a defendant sent a single email/post/call that says, 'I am going to kill you, your husband, and your children.' Although this is a single criminal threat incident, it is meant to threaten or harass more than one person explicitly. If the threat targets an institution (e.g., an HBCU), each institution equals one entity; threats to 2 HBCUs would be coded as Multiple Target = "yes". Similarly, if the threat mentions harm to 'Jews' and 'Blacks' this would also be seen as Multiple Target = "yes" as these racial-ethnic groups are two distinct groups; if only 'Jews', 'Blacks', or singular organizational entity like 'the FBI' without evidence to suggest additional groups are targeted or that specific members of the organization are targeted (i.e., referring to multiple specific FBI agents either by name or identifiable within the context of the threat), this would ***not*** be coded as 'yes'.
[66]This includes cases in which the defendant threatens an identifiable group of people at a specific location (e.g. "All Jews at Harvard are next") or where the target is identifiable in the context of the threat (e.g., when threat is directed at the family members or close associates of a target, as in "I know where your kids go to school"). When making a determination on this variable, coders should ask themselves if the threat/harassment is actionable: could protective measures be taken based on the content of the threat? For instance, protective actions to protect the target would likely not be possible for a threat to "Kill

b) No[67] (threat is directed at a broad, non-specific person, group, ideology, demographic, or movement)

Other:

21) ThreatNotes: What notable, additional, or atypical details were associated with the defendant's threat/harassment content or conduct? [Text]

a) Open response; possible codes could include:
   i) The case was an act of "swatting";
   ii) unique aspects of the threat content like specific symbols or references;
   iii) sharing of a manifesto;
   iv) defendant's use of specific tools to conceal their identity (AI-applications like deepfakes, Tor/dark web browsers, VPNs)

b) If there is nothing to add, write "N/A"

22) CoderName: The name of the coder completing the threat variables [Text]

a) FirstName LastName; SecondPersonFirstName LastName; ThirdPerson….

23) PrimaryCodingDocument: What evidentiary record was used to code the threat portion of the case? [Categorical]

a) Affidavit[68]
b) Complaint
c) Indictment[69]
d) Government Memorandum/Motion[70]
e) Plea
f) Statement of Offense
g) Factual Basis

tPP's standard Variables:

24) DATE *(e.g., 01/01/1998)*[71] What date did the incident occur?

---

all the Jews" because it is generalized and non-specific, but a threat to "Kill all the Jews at Harvard" could warrant protective measures at Harvard, and would thus be coded as 'Yes' for this variable.

[67] If the threat/harassment communication includes threats to a generalized or diffuse group of people or institutions, code as "no." Threats aimed at a category of people rather than a specific instance of that category should be coded as 'no'. For example, threats such as "Every socialist must die", or threats against entities like "the deep state", "the Jews", or "Democrats" are not specific/identifiable on their own. If a threat was aimed at the "All Democrats in Anytown City Council," this would be coded as 'yes', as the intended target is identifiable within the context of the threat. Similarly, a threat to "shoot up a school" would only be considered specific/identifiable if the targeted school is either named or otherwise identifiable in context (i.e., "I will shoot up Anytown Elementary" = 'Yes').

[68] (e.g., affidavit in support of a criminal complaint or arrest)

[69] Includes Bill of Information.

[70] (e.g., Support of Detention, Sentencing)

[71] In the case that you do not have a specific date, use the first day of the month (*e.g., 05/01/2010*).

a) Since there are multiple ways to date a case, refer to the hierarchical order based on the information available:
    1. Date of most recent (i.e. final) indictment
    2. Date of Criminal Complaint or other charging document
    3. Date defendant entered plea/plea accepted
    4. Date defendant was arrested/arraigned
    5. Date of attack/crime
    6. Date of conviction/sentence
    7. Unknown/unclear

25) DATE DESCRIPTOR What stage in the prosecution does this date describe?

a) Indictment
    i) This includes any dated document stating indicted charges including Waiver of Indictment, or the formal announcement of indictment/charging from DOJ or media.
    ii) Sometimes a defendant is indicted by a 'Bill of Information', often listed as 'Information,' which can be coded as an indictment.
    iii) If superseding indictment is issued, use date for newest/final indictment/announcement of charges.
    iv) In the event of a mistrial resulting in reindictment, use the date for the latest indictment which includes all charges (*e.g., USA v. Charles Harrison Barbee, Robery Sherman Berry, Verne Jay Merrell*)
b) Complaint
    i) This is the date the defendant received an official Criminal Complaint, Criminal Information, Affidavit in Support of a Criminal Complaint, or Arrest Warrant
c) Plea
    i) This is the date the defendant enters a plea or the date that plea was accepted by the court.
d) Arrest/arraignment
    i) This is the date the defendant was arrested or arraigned.
e) Crime/attack
    i) This is the date the crime allegedly occurred.
f) Conviction or Sentenced
    i) This is the date the defendant was convicted.
g) Unknown/unclear
    i) A date is available, but it is not clear what stage of the process it represents.

26) CASE ID The 8-digit M/D/Y value + the defendant's initials *(e.g., 01011998_AA for a defendant indicted on January 1, 1998 with the name Amy Arsonist)*.

- For multiple prosecutions of the same person *(e.g., state and federal cases*), the individual will have multiple rows in the spreadsheet named accordingly *(e.g.,*

01011992_JS, 02251998_JS). Defendants are given separate rows for each prosecution. In these cases, the defendant's name (Full Legal Name, variable E) should also be marked with a number, for example:

- Amy Arsonist (1)
- Amy Arsonist (2)

- If there are co-offenders:
  - i) In addition to the unique Case ID, add an ending which includes a group name in all caps *(e.g., MIMILITIA for the Michigan Militia, etc.)* that reflects the case as a whole. Include a number after the group name to indicate the defendant's names order in the group. This is usually determined by the order they are listed in the indictment.
    - (1) *e.g.,* Andrew Stepanian and Kevin Kjonaas were both part of the group Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC):
      - (a) 05262004_AS_SHAC1
      - (b) 05262004_KK_SHAC2
    - (2) <u>If there is no obvious group acronym</u> for the case, use the full last name of the first defendant on the indictment (or others if the group identifier is already in use), in this case Mousa Abu Marzook and Nadia Elashi:
      - (a) 12172002_MAM_ELASHI1
      - (b) 12172002_NE_ELASHI2
    - (3) If the group name ends in a number *(e.g., PROJECT7, NATO3, etc.*), use a hyphen between the group name and individual number:
      - *(a)* 05062004_DB_PROJECT7-1
      - (b) 05062004_TB_PROJECT7-2
    - (4) Group names should **NOT** include hyphens or underscores (except in the case listed directly above)
  - ii) If an individual has co-offenders but all co-offenders are excluded from the data set (*i.e., died before indictment, did not receive a felony charge, etc.*) they should not have a group identifier with their Case ID

27) GROUP IDENTIFIER Did the defendant's case involve other co-offenders, co-conspirators, or co-defendants? I.e., Did the members intentionally work together to commit the crime?

- **a)** Check against the master list of group identifiers. Copy the exact name from the list, and if it is a new group, add the group identifier to the list. The group identifier can be a defendant's name, or a notable fact/location/acronym/etc. From the case. List group identifier (e.g., SMITH) in all capital letters, followed by a number (e.g., SMITH1, SMITH2…), one for each defendant in the group case
- b) **Note:** Protests, riots, and other large, collective actions present challenges for coding this variable. In general, protestors/rioters arrested at the same event would *not* require a group identifier and be coded individually. However, in cases

where a single set of source documents describe numerous defendants, a Group Identifier can be used (e.g., DCUNREST-SWANN, J20). This avoids having to make redundant copies of the same documents filed under each defendant. If defendants are featured individually in news accounts, these documents can be filed in the Group folder with the defendant's Case ID.

c) If there's no group/co-defendants, write 'No group'
d) If an individual has co-offenders but all co-offenders are excluded from the data set, write **'No group*'** *(e.g., Dzhokhar Tsarnaev and Tamerlan Tsarnaev bombed the Boston marathon, but Tamerlan was killed in an altercation with police. So, only Dzhokhar would be included)*

28) FULL LEGAL NAME *(e.g., John Evan Smith Jr.)*

- If an individual is included in the dataset multiple times, indicate this with a number following their full legal name *(e.g., Ramzi Yousef (1), Ramzi Yousef (2))*.
- If an individual is unnamed, they should be **excluded**. These may be unnamed minors, adults whose names are redacted (e.g., cooperating witness), or adults with unknown identities (*e.g., John/Jane Doe*). Individuals named through non-identifiable labels (*e.g., by initials, my alphanumeric strings*) can be **included**.

29) FIRST NAME All parts of defendant's name *excluding* the family name *(e.g., John Evan Jr.)*.

30) FAMILY NAME The defendant's surname *(e.g., Smith)*.

- For Spanish-language names, following standard naming conventions based on the following example: Jose Juan Ramírez De Silva would be listed as, **First name:** Jose Juan Ramírez, **Family name:** De Silva.[72]
- For Arabic-language names, following standard naming conventions based on the following example: Ibrahim Awad Ibrahim Ali al-Badri al-Samarrai, **First name:** Ibrahim Awad Ibrahim Ali, **Family name:** al-Badri al-Samarrai. This will vary widely, and may require a bit of investigation to determine a defendant's family/tribal name (*i.e., last name*). Whenever possible, kunyas *(i.e., an adult name derived from their eldest child, such as Abu/Umm Nidal Father of/Mother of Nidal*) should be coded under the Known Aliases variable, preserving First Name and Family Name for those assigned at birth or through marriage.
- In the case where a defendant does not have a family/last name, use the value "N/A" (e.g., **09092008_O_OBAIDULLAH2**)

31) OTHER NAMES/ALIASES Is the defendant identified through any other names in the court records or other secondary sources?

[72] These naming conventions vary widely across countries, economic classes, and time periods. These conventions are meant as guides and challenging names should be given a second examination and consult with a Leadership Team member if unsure.

- If an individual has no known aliases, the cell should be coded 'None'
- Misspellings and mis-ordered names should be recorded here as well (e.g. record 'Alicce' if it appears in a court record for defendant 'Alice'). This includes their nicknames (e.g., legal name Richard, referred to in news accounts as Dick, the latter would qualify as an Other Name).
- Include usernames, screen names, online personas, etc., commonly listed in affidavits
    - Note: When recording screen names, follow them with the name of the platform in parentheses, for example: "ThisIsMyInsta (Instagram)"
- Whenever possible, kunyas *(i.e., an Arabic-language name derived from the individual's eldest child, such as Abu/Umm Nidal, Father of/Mother of Nidal)* can be listed as a Known Alias. For example, with the former head of the Islamic State, often referred to as Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi (Father of Bakr of Baghdad), this name would be included as a Known Aliases, and his birth name, Ibrahim Awad Ibrahim Ali al-Badri al-Samarrai, used to populate prior variables: First Name and Family Name.
- Separate numerous entries with semicolons, for example: "FirstAlias; SecondAlias; ScreenName (Platform)"

32) CO-OFFENDERS Does the defendant have any co-offenders, co-conspirators, or co-defendants?[73]

a) Yes
b) No

33) REASON FOR INCLUSION Which of the criteria for inclusion does the case meet? *[Note: As this is a difficult variable to uniformly code, there is a more complete protocol for determining Reason for Inclusion in the Appendix of this Codebook]*

a) Obvious socio-political aim
    i) This includes cases in which the crime has a stated or obvious socio-political aims *(i.e., in furtherance of a political agenda)* as determined through deductive investigation.
b) Supports organized political violence
    i) This includes cases in which the crime serves to support *organized* political violence by an FTO, DTO, or HVE network, or is labeled as such by a State speech act, or determined through deductive investigation.
c) State speech act
    - This includes cases in which the group, individual, or act is labeled as an FTO/DTO/terroris*[74]/HVE/extremis* through a State speech act.

[73] This includes legal co-defendants as well as individuals who commit a crime together, regardless of the date of the indictment or if the second individual is charged criminally.
[74] "TERRORIS*" is meant to include the words "terrorist", "terrorism", "terroristic", "terrorizing" just as "EXTREMIS*" includes "extremist", "extremism." This would also include individuals who are charged with a crime entitled *terrorism, terrorists*, etc (e.g., Making Terroristic Threats).

- For example, if a defendant is linked (through a speech act) to a movement that does not constitute State Speech, however, if that individual is labeled as being a member of a specific and ***designated*** Foreign Terrorist Organization (e.g., Al-Qaeda, Terrorgram Collective, MS-13) which has itself been labeled through State Speech, then that can meet the criteria.

- This may include cases which the State claims are in furtherance of terrorism but have otherwise no obvious socio-political aims *(e.g., 'fake licenses' cases)* and NOT in furtherance of *organized* political violence.
- A case does not meet the requirements for State Speech if it is labeled in another way (e.g., Hate Crime) by State authorities.
- Lower thresholds such as DOJ case 'tags' (e.g., Domestic Terrorism), or investigative approaches (e.g., Joint Terrorism Task Force) can also be used.

d) Obvious socio-political aim AND Supports organized political violence
e) Obvious socio-political aim AND State speech act
f) Supports organized political violence AND State speech act
g) Obvious socio-political aim AND Supports organized political violence AND State speech act

34) NAME OF CASE What is the name of the court case *(e.g., United States of America v. John Evan Smith Jr.)*?

- For federal cases, the prosecution is the U.S. government *(e.g., United States of America)*.
- For state cases, the prosecution is the state in which the legal proceedings occur *(e.g., State of Ohio, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)*.
- *For cases which are not federal or state, the prosecuting agent will vary from District Attorneys' offices, Sheriffs Departments, cities, municipal bodies, etc.*
- For cases with a single defendant, write the entire full name of the defendant *(e.g., John Evan Smith Jr.)*.
- Cases with multiple defendants:
  - For two - three defendants, include only the last names of the defendants *(e.g., United States of America v. Boggis, Bunce, & Bean)*.
  - For four or more defendants, include only the last name of the first defendant followed by a comma and "et al." *(e.g., United States of America v. Boggis, et al.)*.

35) JURISDICTION Under which jurisdiction was the case prosecuted?[75]

[75] If the defendant is prosecuted at the federal level as well as a state/non-federal level, make two separate entries, marking a number after the defendants' name in each row (e.g., John Smith (1); John Smith (2)) See Manual for details.

a) Federal[76]
b) Non-Federal (e.g., city, county, state)

36) LOCATION: COUNTRY In which country did the crime occur?

- Capitalize the country, spell it out correctly, and do *not* put a space after the country *(e.g., United States).*
- If the crime occurred in multiple countries, write "Multiple countries"
- If the exact location is unknown, write "Unknown"
- In the case of an Internet-based crime (e.g. threats on various online sites), use the country **where the perpetrator was physically located** while committing the crime.

37) LOCATION: STATE In which US state did the crime occur?

- Capitalize the state, spell it out correctly, and do *not* put a space after the state *(e.g., Ohio).*
- If the crime occurred outside the United States, write "Outside U.S."
- If the crime occurred in multiple states, write "Multiple states"
- If the exact location is unknown, write "Unknown"
- In the case of an Internet-based crime (e.g. threats on various online sites), use the state where the perpetrator was physically located while committing the crime.

38) LOCATION: CITY: In which US city did the crime occur?

- Capitalize the city, spell it out correctly, and do *not* put a space after the city *(e.g., Cincinnati).*[77]
- If the crime occurred outside the United States, write "Outside U.S."
- If the crime occurred in multiple cities, write "Multiple cities"
- If the crime occurred in a national park that is not technically part of a city, just write the name of the national park
- If the exact location is unknown, write "Unknown"
- In the case of an Internet-based crime (e.g. threats on various online sites), use the city where the perpetrator ***was physically located*** while committing the crime.

39) PEOPLE VS. PROPERTY Did this crime intend to target human beings, material property, both, or neither?

a) People

[76] This includes cases prosecuted in DC *Superior* Court and prosecuted by federal agents (e.g., J20, Brennen Marquise Sermon). While there is a federal US District Court for the District of Columbia, cases can be prosecuted in *superior* court by federal attorneys from the US Attorney's Office and should be considered *federal* cases. This is due in part to DC's non-statehood status.

[77] In the case of crimes occurring in New York City, NY, list the city as the specific borough: Manhattan, Queens, Staten Island, Brooklyn or Long Island.

i) This includes crimes designed to injure or kill human beings. Property damage occurring must be incidental/collateral/accidental *(e.g., Boston Marathon, Pulse Nightclub).*
ii) This includes crimes designed to intimidate or harass human beings. Property damage must be incidental *(e.g., cross burning)*.

b) Property
   i) This includes crimes designed to damage/defend property with no or little risk to life. Any harm caused to human beings must be incidental. *(e.g., abortion clinic after hours, home under construction, vandalism, tree sit).*
c) People and property
   i) This includes crimes designed to both damage property and kill individuals, property damage must be understood as intentional and not incidental *(e.g., 9/11, 1993 WTC, indoor bombing where people are present).*
   ii) This includes crimes designed to intimidate or harass human beings through the use of intentional property damage *(e.g., graffiti containing threatening messages).*
d) No direct target
   i) This includes crimes which are not designed to harm people or property, but which serve to support political violence *(i.e., bank robbery or providing monetary/material support for terrorist groups).*
e) Unspecified/unknown/undeveloped
   i) This includes crimes that do not have a target *(e.g., immigration violations).*

40) PHYSICAL TARGET What was the function of the physical target of the crime *(i.e., <u>where</u>, not why)*?

- FEDERAL SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site owned by the United States government.
  - ➢ Federal site: non-military non-judicial *(e.g., White House, U.S. embassy/consulate, polling station, BATF)*
  - ➢ Federal site: military *(e.g., Army base)*
  - ➢ Federal site: judicial *(e.g., court house, US Marshall Service)*
  - ➢ Federal site: non-U.S. embassy or consulate
- STATE SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site owned by a state government.
  - ➢ State site: non-military non-judicial *(e.g., state legislature, DMV)*
  - ➢ State site: judicial *(e.g., state court house)*
- MUNICIPAL SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site owned by a local municipality.
  - ➢ Municipal: local law enforcement *(e.g., police station)*
  - ➢ Municipal: local rescue services *(e.g., fire stations, ambulance)*

- MASS TRANSPORTATION SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site used for mass transportation, but *do not* include private modes of transport *(e.g., personal automobile)*
    - ➢ Mass transportation: air *(e.g., airplanes, airport, NOT airline office if offsite)*
    - ➢ Mass transportation: ground *(e.g., trains, train stations, bus, subway, elevated train, streetcar, tram)*
    - ➢ Mass transportation: water *(e.g., boat)*
    - ➢ Mass transportation: infrastructure (*e.g., bridge, highway (e.g., Iyman Faris))*
- PRIVATE SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site owned by private individuals.
    - ➢ Private site: business/corporate property *(e.g., World Trade Center, airline office, restaurant, construction sites if the property is owned by a developer, hotels, NGOs, local political offices)*
    - ➢ Private site: residential *(e.g., home, trailer park, apartment, private home under construction, retirement home (e.g., Mustafa Mohamed), personal automobile)*
- PUBLIC SITE: This includes crimes which target a physical site used for public purposes by the general public.
    - ➢ Public site: event *(e.g., parade, sports event, march, protest)*
    - ➢ Public: commercial space of recreation *(e.g., mall, movie theater, park, bar, nightclub, concert)*
    - ➢ Public: non-commercial space *(e.g., park, monument/statue, street/neighborhood)*
    - ➢ Religious/faith-based institutions *(e.g., church, mosque, temple, parochial/religious schools)*[78].
    - ➢ Educational institution *(e.g., university, college, primary school, high school, excludes parochial/religious schools).*
    - ➢ Medical institution *(e.g., hospital, clinic, doctors office, including abortion-related).*

a) Online (i.e., websites, data repository, other online locations such as *Hassan Abujihaad released sensitive military information online).*

b) Individual person(s)
    i) This includes crimes which target an individual or group of individuals *independent of their location* at the time of the crime.[79]

c) Multiple types
    i) This includes crimes which target multiple locations for different purposes *(e.g., Eric Robert Rudolph attacking both the Olympic games, a nightclub, and an abortion provider).*

[78] This would include, for example, vehicles parked at religious institutions which were targeted due to the presumed religious identity of their owners (e.g., Osama E. El Hannouny).
[79] For example, if a person was killed because they were an abortion provider inside of their church, the target is coded as INDIVIDUAL PERSON and not RELIGIOUS SITE.

d) No direct target
    i) This includes crimes which have no physical target *(e.g., document fraud, material support for terrorism).*
e) Unspecified/unknown/undeveloped
    i) This includes crimes in which a physical target is anticipated, but, at the time of arrest/indictment, unclear *(e.g., conspiracy cases).*

41) IDEOLOGICAL TARGET What characteristics *of the target* made it appealing to the defendant?

- GOVERNMENT: This includes targets chosen because of their affiliation (or presumed connection) with the U.S. government.
    - ➢ Government: federal *(e.g., White House)*
    - ➢ Government: state *(e.g., state capitol)*
    - ➢ Government: foreign/non-U.S. *(e.g., foreign embassy or consulate)*
    - ➢ Government: international *(e.g., UN)*
    - ➢ Government: military *(e.g., soldiers, base, recruiting station)*
    - ➢ Government: police *(e.g., officers, stations, vehicles)*
    - ➢ Government: first responders *(i.e., firefighters, EMTs, police, other public servants who are not federal employees)*
- INDUSTRY: This includes targets chosen because of their affiliation (or presumed connection) with a specific industry.
    - ➢ Industry: technology/research [not animal related] *(e.g., anti-technology, GMO facilities, or other controversial tech including nanotechnology, robots, 5G, etc.)*
    - ➢ Industry: animal products/food/research *(e.g., dairy, meat, fur, research/testing facility, breeder, farm)*
    - ➢ Industry: land development *(e.g., logging/construction sites)*
    - ➢ Industry: adult entertainment *(e.g., pornography store)*
    - ➢ Industry: abortion *(e.g., Planned Parenthood)*
    - ➢ Industry: private corporations *(e.g., Starbucks office)*
    - ➢ Industry: place of attacker's employment *(assuming this is the reason it was attacked)*
- RELIGIOUS: This includes targets chosen because of their affiliation (or presumed connection) with a religious institution (includes educational institutions if attacked due to religious affiliation).
    - ➢ Religious: Christian *(e.g., church, school, camp, Christian persons)*
    - ➢ Religious: Jewish *(e.g., synagogue, school, camp, Jewish persons)*
    - ➢ Religious: Muslim *(e.g., mosque, school, camp, Muslim persons)*
    - ➢ Religious: Sikh *(e.g., gurdwara, school, camp, Sikh persons)*
    - ➢ Religious: other/multiple (e.g., a religious site of a different affiliation, multi-denominational religious site, multiple religious ideological targets)

- IDENTITY: This includes targets chosen because of their connection (or presumed connection) to a particular identity-based community.
    - ➢ Identity: race/ethnicity
        - These crimes target the general public seeking to harm individuals of a specific race/ethnicity *(e.g., Dylann Roof targeting an AME church, placing IED in specific neighborhood where a race/ethnicity resides)*;
        - AND/OR crimes which are part of a larger racial/ethnic conflicts *(e.g., white supremacist crimes)*.
    - ➢ Identity: nationality
        - These crimes target the general public seeking to harm individuals of a specific nationality *(e.g., airplane hijacking where people are separated based on citizenship, placing IED in specific neighborhood where a nationality resides)*;
        - AND/OR crimes which are part of a larger ethno-national separatist campaigns.
    - ➢ Identity: gender/sexuality
        - These crimes target the general public seeking to harm individuals of a specific sexuality *(e.g., targeting the PRIDE parade)* or gender *(e.g., incels)*.
    - ➢ Identity: political affiliation
        - These crimes target the general public seeking to harm individuals of a specific political affiliation *(e.g., sending bomb threats to Democrats, anti-fascist attacks targeting MAGA attendees)*.
    - ➢ Identity: other
        - These crimes target individuals due to their identity, but not based in racial, ethnic, national, gender, sexual or political bias. (e.g., targeting someone due to their perceived mental illness or status as homeless)

a) General public
    i) This includes targets chosen in order to harm the general public <u>*excluding*</u> targeting which is influenced by factors above *(e.g., nationality, religion, etc.)*.

b) Multiple motivations
    i) This includes crimes in which one or more targets are chosen for multiple motivations.

c) Unspecified
    i) This includes crimes which have no clear ideological target *(e.g., document fraud, material support for terrorism)*.

42) IDEOLOGICAL AFFILIATION What belief system, if any, motivated the defendant to commit the crime?[80]

- RIGHTIST: Though taking a variety of forms, a rightist position embraces values such as limited government/opposition to governmental authority, socially conservative thought, individual rights, authoritarianism, and (often) racial or ethnic supremacy
  - ➢ Rightist: identity-focused
    - This encompasses individuals who desire social-political change rooted in identity-based prejudice *(i.e., racists, white supremacists, skinheads, anti-immigrant/xenophobic extremists, anti-LGBTQ extremists, misogynists)*;
    - AND/OR those who support white nationalist, accelerationist fascist, and/or identitarian ideologies *(i.e., neo-Confederate, neo-Nazi, alt-right,* identitarians*, eco-fascist, O9A)*.
  - ➢ Rightist: government-focused
    - This encompasses individuals who desire autonomy from the government *(i.e., Sovereign Citizens, libertarians)*;
    - AND/OR those who act to prevent government overreach *(i.e., anti-tax extremists, militias, Patriots/Constitutionalists)*;
    - OR those which act as pro-government vigilantes and paramilitary forces *(e.g., Minutemen, Oath Keepers,* United Constitutional Patriots*, AUC)*.
  - ➢ Rightist: abortion-focused
    - This encompasses individuals who are opposed to abortion services. *(e.g., Army of God, Operation Rescue)*.
  - ➢ Rightist: unspecified
    - Only use this code for right wing individuals who can not be sorted into any of the above rightist categories *(e.g., Cesar Sayoc)*.
- LEFTIST: Though taking a variety of forms, a leftist position embraces values such as social equality, decentralized/horizontal government, socially progressive thought, and opposition to capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism.
  - ➢ Leftist: identity-focused
    - This encompasses individuals who desire social-political change rooted in identity-based prejudice *(e.g., anti-racists, anti-fascists, anti-technologists e.g., Theodore Kaczynski)*.
  - ➢ Leftist: government-focused
    - This encompasses individuals who desire social-political change rooted in anti-capitalism *(i.e., Marxists, communists, anarcho-syndicalists, democratic socialists)*;

[80] In order to determine ideological affiliation, one can examine State speech, self-identification (e.g., statement by defendant), or analysis and interpretation of motive and rationale as provided by secondary sources.

        - AND/OR individuals who desire social-political change rooted in anti-statism *(i.e., anarchists, insurrectionaries, anti-authoritarians)*.
    - ➢ Leftist: eco-animal focused
        - This encompasses individuals who animal abuse *(i.e., animal liberationists, hunt saboteurs)*;
        - AND/OR individuals who desire social-political change rooted in environmental rights *(i.e., earth liberationists, eco-saboteurs)*.
    - ➢ Leftist: unspecified
        - Only use this code for left-wing individuals who can not be sorted into any of the above leftist categories.
- ➢ Nationalist-separatist
    - This encompasses individuals who desire self-determination and/or sovereignty for their national, ethnic, or religious constituency *(e.g., Armenian/ASALA, Basque/ETA, Jewish Defense League, Irish/IRA, Moro/MILF, Puerto Rican/FALN/FRB, Sikh/KLF, Tamil/LTTE, Palestinian/PFLP/DFLP/HAMAS/PIJ)*.
- ➢ Salafi/Jihadist/Islamist *(e.g., Al Qaeda, Islamic State, Hezbollah)*
    - This encompasses individuals who desire social-political change based in an interpretation of Islam as a political-religious framework.
- ➢ Other
    - This encompasses individuals who desire social-political change with a clear ideological position not described above *(i.e., anti-police yet not leftist or rightist, challenging specific national government/policy, Black Hebrew Israelites, other Black nationalists) (e.g., Mitchell Hapner, Lamin Khalifa Fhimah, Steve Kim, Eid Elwirelwir, Paul Anthony Ciancia, Colin Ferguson)*.
- ➢ No affiliation/not a factor
    - This encompasses individuals who were not motivated by a desire for socio-political change and/or who possess an ideology which was not a factor in motivating the crime *(e.g., Alfred Heinz Reumayr, Michael Conrade Sibley, Francois Guagni)*.
- ➢ Unclear *(e.g., Rashid Baz, Christopher Dorner)*
    - This is only to be used when a defendant's ideology can not be discerned or is unable to be verified through competing accounts.
    - **If a defendant commits a crime which shows bias (e.g., racial, ethnic, religious, etc.) but has no additional indicators of ideology (e.g., comments made at arrest, clothing insignias, ephemera discovered during a search warrant, etc.) Unclear is a likely suitable value.**

43) **AFFILIATION WITH FTO** Was the defendant affiliated with a Foreign Terrorist Organization as identified by the United States Department of State[81] at the time of indictment?[82]
    a) Yes
    b) No[83]

44) **GROUP AFFILIATION** With what group, if any, did the defendant have a known connection[84] at the time of the crime?[85]
    - Check the master list of known groups. Select the relevant group affiliation from the dropdown list in the Team Spreadsheet. If a group is not included on this list, reach out to a member of tPPLT to address this
    - If there's no known group affiliation, select 'No known affiliation'
    - If the individual is *known* to be a part of a group, but the official group name is not listed, select 'Unspecified affiliation'
    - If the individual is involved in more than one group, select all relevant groups. Please ensure that the group affiliations are separated by a comma
    - If the defendant has a known prior affiliation, but it is unclear if the affiliation still stands, such information should be noted in the Additional Details ***and*** Short Narrative variables but ***not*** in group affiliation

45) **HATE CRIME:** Was the crime designated as a hate crime or as being motivated by bias?[86]
    a) Yes
        i) This includes cases with hate crime charges *(The Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act)*;

---

[81] For the complete FTO list see: https://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm. FTO designation only applies from the date of designation forward or until removal

[82] For a list of delisted FTOs, see here https://www.state.gov/foreign-terrorist-organizations/ and scroll down to "Delisted Foreign Terrorist Organizations." Defendants should be judged based on the status of the FTO ***at the time of indictment***. For example, the FARC was considered an FTO 10/8/1997 - 12/1/2021 according to that list. If a defendant was indicted for a FARC-linked crime 11/31/21 it would be coded as FTO = YES. However, if the defendant was indicted for a FARC-affiliated crime 12/1/21 or anytime after, it would be coded as FTO = NO.

[83] If there is no definitive evidence or State speech claiming FTO affiliation, presume 'no'

[84] Connection is meant to imply any evidence-based relationship between the defendant and a known/named group/network/moniker including but not limited to membership, providing or attempting to provide assistance or aid, communication with. Affiliation is determined by whatever the defendant and/or the government claims the affiliation to be, regardless of the evidence to support it. If government sources assign a group affiliation to a defendant, we record that affiliation even if the defendant denies it. If a defendant self-identifies with a group (e.g., 'I did this for ISIS,' 'I am a Proud Boy'), even if that claim is not repeated by the government, we record that as their Group Affiliation.

[85] For this variable, involvement in a movement does not equate to being affiliated with a group. For example, the white supremacist movement or antifa are not groups themselves but individuals may be members of a specific group within that movement, such as the Aryan Nations, or Rose City Antifa.

[86] Actions which inhibit the exercise of things that are fundamental to who a person is (religion, race, etc.) are the focus of hate crime legislation. Assembly is not considered to be fundamental to who a person

ii) cases **labeled** as bias motivation (by 'authorities' on the subject[87]);
iii) charges labeled as **civil rights violations** *(Interference with housing rights/fair housing act)*;
iv) cases with Hate Crime **enhancements**, as well as cases with language in government documents that clearly indicate such.[88]

b) No[89]

46) LEO INFORMANT Did the case involve law enforcement (e.g., FBI's undercover federal agent) misrepresenting themselves to defendants as co-conspirators, or non-law enforcement officers (i.e., civilians) who were ***tasked and paid*** by law enforcement?[90]

a) Yes
b) No[91]

47) PREVIOUS SIMILAR CRIME Has the defendant been charged or convicted of a previous crime motivated by the same belief system?[92]

a) Yes
b) No

48) CRIMINAL METHOD Through what means did the defendant carry out their crime?[93]

a) Firearms: civilian
i) This includes crimes which utilize small arms or personal firearms *(e.g., pistols, rifles, shotguns) including but not limited to AR/AK-style assault rifles,*

---

[87] For example, the Southern Poverty Law Center, Human Rights Campaign, etc. This means that if an individual scrapes a list of hate crimes by an NGO focused on bias/hate, we will code it as 'Hate Crime' = YES. For the purpose of determining expertise in this area, journalists would not be included. For example, if USA Today issued a list of hate crimes, this would **NOT** be sufficient to mark a case as 'Hate Crime' = YES

[88] List of Federal hate crime laws: https://www.justice.gov/crt/hate-crime-laws

[89] In cases where the hate crime charges are levied and then dropped, this can be coded as **hate crime = "no"**, **if** the hate crime was dropped because investigators/prosecutors determined that hate/boas **did not** motivate the crime. If hate crime charges were levied and then dropped for another reason, such as to solicit a plea bargain, this can be coded as **hate crime = yes** since this would indicate the bias-motive. Whether this value is yes/no should be based on the defendants' motive, not whether prosecutors decided to sustain that particular charge.

[90] In the case of confidential human sources, criminal/cooperating witness and criminal informants should be described in the short narrative and/or Additional Details, but LEO INFORMANT should be coded as 'no'

[91] If an informant is not mentioned (citizen, law enforcement, or other) in court documents or news reports than the assumption is there was no informant

[92] This would also include instances wherein the defendant claims to have acted within the same manner prior, but for which there is no additional evidence (e.g., James F. Nerdrun who implied he had committed anti-abortion crimes in the past but was not charged).

[93] In determining what constitutes a primary versus secondary tactic, researchers are asked to determine which tactic had the greatest impact. This can be measured in terms of casualties, fatalities, financial loss, disruption to essential/public services, and the crime's public, communicative value (i.e. spectacle) to primary and secondary audiences (e.g., ethnic group). In the case of crimes occurring during the January 6 riot at the US Capitol, most defendants have 'Blockading' listed as the primary method *unless* they are said to have engaged in an assault–armed or unarmed–and that assault (i.e., 'Unarmed assault' or 'Other weapons') would thus constitute the primary, and 'Blockading' the secondary.

.50 caliber rifles, semi-automatic pistols, and other firearms legally available for purchase in the US without the acquisition of a Federal Firearms License (FFL).

ii) This includes crimes related to firearm possession, sale and manufacturing, modification, transport, importation, etc.

b) Firearms: military
   i) This includes crimes which utilize military-grade weapons and other technologies not available to the public *(e.g., Rocket-Propelled Grenade, shoulder-fired missile, fully automatic firearm/machine gun, long range sniper rifle).*
   ii) This includes crimes related to military weapon possession, sale and manufacturing, modification, transport, importation, etc.

c) Other weapons
   i) This includes crimes which utilize sharp or blunt weapons *(e.g., knives, tools, bottles, bats, crowbars, hammers), personal defense weapons (e.g., pepper spray, mace, brass knuckles, tasers, baton) or weapons which are more unique and difficult to categorize (e.g., noose, stun cane, laser pointer)*
   ii) This includes commercially-available chemical weapons such as mace, pepper spray, and acids (e.g., battery acid/sulfuric acid, hydrochloric acid, nitric acid, lye) which can be thrown or sprayed in an aerosol.

d) Unarmed assault
   i) This includes crimes which utilize physical violence without the use of a weapon *(e.g., punching, kicking, beating, fighting, grabbing clothing, spitting on someone).*

e) Hostage-taking
   i) This includes crimes which utilize carrying away (i.e., kidnapping) and/or confinement of people against their will *(e.g., Mora-Pestana kidnapping).*

f) Armed intimidation/standoff
   i) This includes crimes which utilize firearms and the threat of violent force in order to hold territory, repel incursion, demonstrate an armed presence, or maintain a standoff *(i.e., Bundy occupation, Respect the Flag, Leith, North Dakota 'takeover').*

g) Blockading/unlawful assembly
   i) This includes crimes which do not utilize weaponry in order to hold territory, repel incursion or maintain a standoff *(e.g., unarmed civil disobedience such as a road blockade*, or the occupation at Standing Rock*).*
   ii) This includes crimes in which individuals' presence at/participation in a protest results in arrest without the use of any additional method *(e.g., participating in a protest without carrying out vandalism or assault; common in Jan. 6 arrests and 2020 BLM arrests)*

h) Explosives

i) This includes crimes which employ the detonation of an Improvised Explosive Device/homemade/commercial explosive devices *(e.g., C-4, dynamite, ANFO, TATP, urea nitrate)*. This also includes intentional non-detonation of viable devices.
ii) This includes crimes related to explosive possession, sale and manufacturing, transport, importation, etc.

i) Arson
   i) This includes crimes which employ the ignition of Improvised Incendiary Devices *(e.g., molotov cocktail, napalm, timed IID),* manual arson *(i.e., use of fire without IID, e.g., pouring accelerant on target and igniting)* and the intentional non-ignition of viable device.
   ii) This includes crimes related to incendiary device possession, sale and manufacturing, transport, importation, etc.

j) Chemical or biological weapon deployment
   i) This includes crimes which utilize the deployment of a CBRN (chemical, biological[94], radiological, nuclear) device.
   ii) This includes crimes related to CBRN possession, sale and manufacturing, unsuccessful/attempted manufacturing transport, importation, etc.
   iii) This **ex**cludes commercially-available chemical weapons such as mace or pepper spray.

k) Threat/harassment
   i) This includes written/verbal/electronic threats/doxxing/false claims/hoaxes/harassment/swatting to harm, harass, or intimidate persons or property through firearms, explosives/CBRN[95] and unspecified or vague means.
   ii) This includes crimes which may involve other means, but are *primarily* a threat/harassment. For example, although a cross burning is an act of arson, it should be coded as "Threat/Harassment" as it is primarily aimed at threatening rather than destroying property by fire.
   iii) Threat/harassment is appropriate to describe so-called "paper terrorism" tactics used by sovereign citizens and other rightists when, for example, they use FBI agents' names to file liens.

l) Vehicle ramming
   i) This includes crimes which utilize a vehicle *(i.e., car, van, truck, etc.)* to cause damage to property or injury and/or death to individuals *(e.g., Mohammed Reza Taheri-azar, Abdul Razak Ali Artan)*.

[94] This would include attempts to infect people with Coronavirus/COVID-19/anthrax **only when** there is reasonable evidence that the individual was infected or believed themselves to be, or possessed or believed themselves to possess an active biological agent (e.g., live anthrax). If they **are not** infected, or reasonably believed to be, the criminal method would be 'Threat/harassment.'
[95] This would include threats to infect people with Coronavirus/COVID-19/anthrax **only when** there is reasonable evidence that the individual was not infected or did not themselves to be. If they **are** infected, or reasonably believe themselves to be, the means would be 'Chemical or biological weapons deployment.'

m) Vandalism/sabotage
    i) This includes crimes which cause deliberate damage to property *(e.g., broken windows, graffiti, lock gluing, machinery damage, tree spiking, animal release/'liberation').*
n) Providing material support
    i) This includes crimes which serve to support a FTO, DTO, HVE network through money, personnel (e.g., trying to join or travel to join an organization, racketeering), weaponry, technical equipment (e.g., night vision, GPS), document fraud, or other means.[96]
    ii) Includes crimes such as drug sales or financial fraud in which funds would be directed to support organized political violence.
o) Perjury/obstruction of justice[97]
    i) This includes crimes in which the defendant lies to officers of the court/law enforcement, or refuses to provide information when questioned in the course of a criminal investigation for a political end.
p) Criminal violation not linked or motivated politically[98]
    i) This includes crimes which have no implicit political message, motivation, or target *(e.g., Francois Guagni).*[99]
q) Unknown/unspecified/undeveloped
    i) This includes crimes in which a specific tactic is anticipated, but, at the time of arrest/indictment, unclear *(e.g., conspiracy cases).*
r) Uncategorized
    i) This includes crimes in which the tactic does not fit into any of the above categories *(e.g., financial fraud, theft, scaling monument, murder for hire).*

49) ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL METHOD Through what additional means, if any, did the defendant carry out their crime?

- *NOTE:* This variable is *not* meant to be a descriptor of criminal method. This is *only* for instances where the value "Various methods" would have been an appropriate

[96] According to 18 USC § 2339A(b)(1), the term "material support or resources" means any property, tangible or intangible, or service, including currency or monetary instruments or financial securities, financial services, lodging, training, expert advice or assistance, safehouses, false documentation or identification, communications equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, personnel (1 or more individuals who may be or include oneself), and transportation, except medicine or religious materials.

[97] The perjury or obstruction of justice has to be furthering a political goal for this to be the criminal method, if the crime is not in furtherance of a political goal (regardless of whether or not it is perjury) than the criminal method is 'criminal violation not linked or motivated politically'

[98] If this is the criminal method, **the additional criminal method must be 'No additional criminal method'** because all other options imply a political motive

[99] This value can ONLY be used in cases in which the Reason for Inclusion is only "State speech". If an individual has an obvious socio-political aim or is supporting organized political violence, their criminal method cannot be "not linked or motivated politically." For instance, if an individual is a member of Atomwaffen and they are picked up on a firearms offense, their tactic is "firearms:civilian," not "criminal violation not linked or motivated politically."

code.[100] If more detail is needed for "Y: Criminal method", this should be captured in the short narrative, *not* in "Z: Additional criminal method".[101]

a) Firearms: civilian
b) Firearms: military
c) Other weapons
d) Unarmed assault
e) Hostage-taking
f) Armed intimidation/standoff
g) Blockading/unlawful assembly
h) Explosives
i) Arson
j) Chemical or biological weapon deployment
k) Threat/harassment
l) Vehicle ramming
m) Vandalism/sabotage
n) Providing material support
o) Perjury/obstruction of justice
p) Various methods
    i) This includes crimes in which various means are employed *(e.g., John Timothy Earnest (1)- arson and firearms).*
q) Uncategorized
r) No additional criminal method

50) COMPLETION OF CRIME To what extent was the crime the defendant intended[102] carried through?

a) Planned but not attempted
    i) This includes crimes which were stopped in the planning stages and were never attempted *(i.e., conspiracy).*
    ii) *Example:* communicating with ISIS members online; researching how to build bombs; buying materials.
b) Attempted

[100] For example, if an individual was attempting to both bomb and shoot a mosque, the primary tactic would be "Explosives" and the secondary tactic would be "Firearms: civilian"
[101] For example, if someone threatens to bomb a site via social media, then their criminal method is "Threat/harassment" and their additional criminal method is "No additional criminal method." To capture that the threat involved explosives, explain this in the short narrative.
[102] For example, if a defendant intends to shoot a human target, but is arrested at the site while armed and charged with "illegal possession of a firearm". In this example, while the crime of "possession" could be said to have been completed, the defendant's aim was the shooting, and thus the case should be coded as "attempted" NOT "completed." In other words, even if the crime they were charged with was accomplished, if their larger plans were not, the crime should not be coded as "completed."

i) This includes crimes in which a *substantial step*[103] was taken toward carrying out the crime. These crimes passed the planning stages but were not carried through. Reasons for failure to carry through could include being stopped by police/bystanders, stopped by the defendant's own volition, and failure due to mistakes on the part of the defendant.

ii) *Example:* stopped by police *before* boarding the plane to go to Syria[104]; taking a built bomb to a target location, but the bomb fails to ignite/explode.

c) Carried through

i) This includes crimes which passed the planning stages, involved a substantial step toward carrying out the crime, AND were carried out to some, if not the full, extent.

ii) *Example:* successfully reaching Syria to join ISIS; bomb detonates (regardless of injuries/deaths).

d) Threat

i) This includes cases in which the crime with which the defendant was charged is making a threat/threatening.

e) Unknown

i) The completion of the crime was not made public or not able to be found.

51) NUMBER KILLED How many people, if any, were killed as a result of the crime? (includes all deaths, both purposeful and accidental, as well as the perpetrator themself)

a) 0-##
b) Unknown

52) NUMBER INJURED How many people, if any, were injured as a result of the crime? (includes all injuries, both purposeful and accidental, as well as the perpetrator themself)

a) 0-##
b) Unknown

53) CHARGES What criminal charges were brought against the defendant?[105]

- Copy all charges levied against the defendant, including those added in superseding indictments or those dropped prior to trial.
- To indicate charges dropped prior to trial, place an asterisk (*) preceding the dropped charge's numerical identification.[106]
    - For example: *18:842(a)(3)(A) Interstate Transport of Explosive Materials;

[103] "A substantial step goes beyond mere preparation to commit the crime. Simply discussing the crime or contemplating it with a friend is also not enough. Rather, the act must be such that it moves the defendant toward the successful completion of the crime, even though the crime is never fully executed" (justia.com)
[104] Note that the actual crime here would be physically boarding the plane to join ISIS, but the individual was stopped before that action could be carried out.
[105] In the event that an individual is pardoned, their charges should remain the same.
[106] Charges dropped as the result of a plea deal should also be indicated in this way (i.e., an asterisk preceding charge)

- Indicate if there are multiple counts of the same charge *(e.g., the defendant received seven counts of aggravated assault against a public servant).* Use brackets ([ ]) and the word 'counts' to indicate multiple counts of the same charge at the end of the charge.
    - For example: 18:842(a)(3)(A) Interstate Transport of Explosive Materials [5 counts];
- When available, include the statute numbers before the charge, removing words like section (e.g., 18 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1) can be changed to 18:1114(1)).
    - Note that while we take out the "U.S.C.", leave in abbreviations for state criminal codes such as 'O.R.C." for Ohio Revised code.
- Place a semicolon (;) to separate each individual charge.
- If information on the charges is not available or if charging information is sealed, write 'Charges sealed' or 'Data not available' in the cell.
- If charges include misdemeanors, use parentheses to indicate misdemeanor at the end of the charge.
    - For example: 18:842(a)(3)(A) Interstate Transport of Explosive Materials (Felony); 18:844(i) Arson Involving Interstate Commerce (Misdemeanor);
- In sum, a 'formula' for charges can be represented as:

  STATUTE#(modifiers) Name of Charge (severity) [# counts];

  18:844(i) Arson Affecting Interstate Commerce (felony) [4 counts];

For example:

- For multiple charges each with a single count, one of which was dropped
    - 18:844(e) Interstate Threats Involving Explosives; *18:876(c) Mailing Interstate Threats to Injure;
- For one charge with multiple counts, one of which was dropped[107]
    - *18:844(e) Interstate Threats Involving Explosives; 18:844(e) Interstate Threats Involving Explosives [2 counts];
- For multiple charges some with a multiple count
    - 18:371.F Conspiracy to defraud the United States; 18:844I.F Explosives (except on vessels) [2 counts]; 18:924.C FIrearms [4 counts]
- For defendants with felonies and misdemeanors and multiple counts
    - 18:922(k) Unlawful Possession of a Firearm (Felony) [2 counts]; 18:3571 - Sentence of fine (Misdemeanor);

54) PLEA How did the defendant plead to the charges?[108]

a) Guilty: plea bargain/blind plea[109,110]

i) This also includes cases in which the defendant pled guilty without a plea bargain in place (i.e., a normal guilty plea);

[107] This example represents three total counts of the charge, with one being dropped. If necessary, this can be further clarified in Additional Details.
[108] If the plea is changed, this value should reflect the latest plea.
[109] If the defendant took a non-cooperating plea deal, the non-cooperating aspect of the plea should be moved to the "Additional Sentencing" column.
[110] If the defendant enters an Alford Plea, it is categorized as a guilty plea and this can be noted in the Short Narrative.

ii) AND/OR the defendant pled guilty to a less serious charge, or to one or more of the charges, in return for the dismissal of other charges;
iii) AND/OR that the defendant pled guilty to the original criminal charge in return for a more lenient sentence.

b) Not guilty: blind plea
   i) This is an initial plea of "not guilty" that denies any involvement of the defendant in the stated crime.
c) Not guilty: special defense
   i) This includes claims of defense by the defendant that mitigate their responsibility for the crime *(e.g., guilty by reason of insanity, self-defense, divine obligation).*
d) No contest
   i) This is a plea in which the defendant neither admits nor disputes a charge.
e) Charged but not tried
   i) This includes cases in which the individual is indicted but the individual does not enter a plea and is not taken to trial due to extenuating circumstances (i.e., charges dropped, death/suicide, fugitive status).
f) Data not available
   i) This includes cases in which the defendant's plea is not public / sealed or unable to be found through PACER or state court records.
g) Pending
   i) This includes cases in which the defendant has not yet entered a criminal plea but is expected to.

55) VERDICT What was the final verdict of the criminal case?[111]

a) Guilty
   i) This includes criminal proceedings in which the judge or jury finds the defendant guilty on all counts .
b) Not guilty
   i) This includes criminal proceedings in which the judge or jury finds the defendant not guilty on all counts.
c) Guilty on some charges/not guilty on others
   i) This includes criminal proceedings in which the judge or jury finds the defendant guilty on only some of the charges brought to trial
d) Charged but not tried[112]

[111] The 'verdict' variable only measures charges which were taken to trial. If a charge was dropped prior to jury/judge consideration, that charge is not included in the coding of this variable. The 'verdict' only considers charges that went to trial, not those which were dropped/dismissed.
[112] If an individual is pardoned, their verdict should be 'Charged but not Tried', their 'Length of Prison sentence', 'Life Sentence', and 'Death Sentence' should be '#' and their pardon should be reflected in the 'Additional Details' and the 'Tag' variables.

i) This includes cases in which the indictment is dropped prior to trial or criminal proceedings cannot continue due to extenuating circumstances *(i.e., death/suicide, fugitive status).*

e) Pending/Hung jury/mistrial
   i) This includes criminal proceedings that are not yet resolved *(i.e., ongoing court cases,, defendants found incompetent to stand trial).*
   ii) This includes criminal proceedings in which the jury was unable to reach a consensus or in which the trial must be forfeited for other legal reasons.
   iii) This value should serve as a temporary placeholder while awaiting a final case verdict.

f) Data not available
   i) This includes criminal proceedings in which the outcome of the trial is not public / sealed or unable to be found in PACER or state court records.

56) LENGTH OF PRISON SENTENCE How many *months* was the defendant sentenced to serve in prison?[113]

a) Number of months *(e.g., 10 years = '120')*[114]
   i) If the defendant is given less than a month, calculate the decimal to the nearest hundredth and use that (e.g., 2 days would be 2/30=.06666666, thus round to .07)
   ii) If a defendant is given a sentence range, for example, 18-24 months, use the higher number, in this case, 24 months
   iii) If a defendant is given a deferred sentence, for example 24 months of incarceration if they fail to complete 24 months of supervised release, then we assume the defendant will meet the conditions of their agreement.[115]
   iv) If a defendant is sentenced to time served, this should be noted in additional details and the sentence is coded as the number of months the defendant spent in jail/prison.[116]

b) X
   i) This is used when the defendant is given a life or death sentence.
   ii) In the case where a defendant is given additional prison time along with a life or death sentence, include the additional prison time here.

[113] For sentences that are served concurrently, the sentence length is the length of the longest sentence. For *non-concurrent* sentencing, defendants' prison sentences should reflect the sum total of time sentenced.

[114] If the defendant is sentenced to home confinement, community service, or any other non-prison/jail confinement, these months are **not** included. For example, if a defendant received "12 months home confinement, 24 months community service, 36 months of supervised release, and $2,000 restitution," **Length of Prison Sentence** would be recorded as 0.

[115] In the case where a defendant's sentence is based upon the successful completion of a program (e.g., supervised release, mental health program), this case should be added to the Updates Calendar to be checked at the scheduled completion of sentence.

[116] This should be calculated through determining the number of months between arrests warrant execution and the time the sentence is delivered.

(1) e.g., a sentence of life plus 30 months would still have '30' coded for prison sentence

c) Pending
   i) This is used when the outcome of a trial is not yet available, ***but*** is expected to be released within a reasonable time frame.
d) #
   i) This is used for sentences that are non-existent because the defendant is a fugitive or was charged but not tried.
e) Data not available
   i) This is used when the outcome of the trial is not public/sealed or unable to be found in PACER or state court records.

57) LIFE SENTENCE How many life sentences did the defendant receive?

a) Number of life sentences
b) Pending
c) #
   i) This is used for sentences that are unknown because the defendant is a fugitive or was charged but not tried.
d) Data not available
   i) This is used when the outcome of the trial is not public / sealed or unable to be found in PACER or state court records.

58) DEATH SENTENCE How many death sentences did the defendant receive?

a) Number of death sentences
b) Pending
c) #
   i) This is used for sentences that are unknown because the defendant is a fugitive or was charged but not tried.
d) Data not available
   i) This is used when the outcome of the trial is not public / sealed or unable to be found in PACER or state court records.

59) ADDITIONAL DETAILS What notable, additional, or atypical charges or conditions were associated with the defendant in order of importance?

- Open response, common codes include:
  i) arrest by federal agents (e.g., FBI, ATF, ICE, DHS, etc.)
  ii) investigative cooperation with multiple agencies
  iii) arrest as part of a national, named operation
  iv) prosecution through specialized statues *(e.g., FACE, RICO, AETA, etc.)*
  v) sentencing enhancement *(e.g., terrorism enhancement, firearms enhancement, hate crime, etc.)*

vi) plea bargain details (*e.g., non-cooperating plea bargains, not guilty by means of insanity)*
vii) incarceration in specialized location *(e.g., Communication Management Unit (CMU), military prison, Guantanamo Bay, etc.)*
viii) pardon, deportation or denaturalization, fugitive, sealed court records, restitution, probation, time served, etc.

b) If there is nothing to add, write "N/A"

60) AGE How old was the defendant at the time of indictment?[117]

a) Age in years including those under the age of 18 if the exact age is known *(e.g., 23 years old = '23')*
b) #
   i) This is used if the age of the defendant is unknown.
c) 17
   i) This is used to denote that the defendant is a minor (under the age of 18) if the exact age is unknown.

61) GENDER What was the defendant's gender at the time of indictment?[118]

a) Male
b) Female
c) Gender non-conforming[119]
d) Unknown/unclear

62) 'OTHER' STATUS: Given the standards of an 'average American jury' in terms of (perceived or actual) ethnicity, religion and/or citizenship, is the defendant understood to be different from 'an average American'?

a) Othered
   i) The defendant is marked as othered if they meet or appear to meet any of the following criteria:
      i. Does the defendant have a name (including chosen name/alias) not readily understood as European?
      ii. Is the defendant Muslim or a Muslim convert?
      iii. Is the defendant an immigrant from a non-Western/European country?
      iv. Is the defendant non-white racially as an 'average person' would read them (i.e., not passing as white)?

[117] If unable to find the date of indictment, use the hierarchical order in variable A in determining the date at which to report the defendant's age.
[118] If unable to find the date of indictment, use the hierarchical order in variable A in determining the date at which to report the defendant's gender.
[119] This value can be used when the defendant's gender and the gender they are labeled with in official government records do not match (e.g., in the case of transgender defendants).

v. Does the defendant have highly visible, immutable (i.e., permanent) body modifications that would be regarded as disfiguring (e.g., extensive facial tattooing)?

b) Non-othered
   i) This is used if the defendant is marked as white, non-foreign born, Judeo-Christian and a non-jihadist (i.e., can pass as a white, American-born, Christian).
c) Unknown
   i) This should only be used when there is insufficient demographic data available to determine other status.

63) RACIAL/ ETHNIC GROUP What is the defendant's race/ethnicity?[120]

a) White/Caucasian
b) Black/African/African American
c) Latino/Hispanic
d) Asian/South Asian
e) Middle Eastern/North African
f) American Indian/Alaska Native
g) Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
h) Biracial/Multiracial
i) Unknown

64) RELIGION What religion, if any, did the defendant associate with at the time of indictment, and if that is unavailable, the time of the crime?[121]

a) Buddhist
b) Christian
c) Jewish
d) Hindu
e) Muslim
f) Sikh
g) Non-religious
h) Unknown[122]
i) Other *(e.g., Wallace Stanley Kennett)*

[120] If the individual is incarcerated in a federal facility, you can use https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/ to locate their race. If it is a non-federal case, you may be able to get the same type of information through their booking information which is often public.
[121] This variable is intended to be a measure of demographics, not necessarily motivation. If the information is available, include the defendants' religion even if it does not motivate the crime. Similarly, we can assume religion if the crime is linked to a religiously-inspired ideology. For example, those committing crimes in the name of Salafi-Jihadist groups can be assumed to be Muslim, those acting in the name of Order of the Nine Angles can be assumed to be Satanists (i.e., Other).
[122] If the information on a defendant's religion is not easily found in news reports and it is not mentioned in court proceedings, the defendant should be coded as "Unknown."

65) VETERAN STATUS Does the defendant have prior military experience (recognized by the United States), and if so, what is their status?

a) Active duty
b) Reserve/national guard (reserve components)
c) Former Active duty
d) Former reserve components
e) Former active duty and reserve components
f) Former active duty and current reserve components
g) Former/current member of non-U.S. military
h) Civilian

66) COMBAT VETERAN If the defendant is a US veteran, did they fight in a war or extended armed conflict?

a) Yes
b) No
c) Unknown

67) SERVICE CLASSIFICATION: what branch of the US military did the individual serve in? Did they serve as a police officer?

- Include all branches served in separated by a coma and indicate their status by adding (current) or (former) after the branch. If an individual is retired from one or more branches but actively serving in another indicate such by adding (current) and (former) to the respective branches
  - ➢ Army
  - ➢ Navy
  - ➢ Air Force
  - ➢ Marine Corps
  - ➢ Coast Guard
  - ➢ National Guard[123]
  - ➢ Army Reserve
  - ➢ Navy Reserve
  - ➢ Marine Corps Reserve
  - ➢ Air Force Reserve
  - ➢ Coast Guard Reserve
  - ➢ Unknown Branch
  - ➢ Police[124]
  - ➢ N/A[125]

  For Example
  - *07032016_MBJ: Army (former), National Guard (former)*
  - *12012013_KMN: Army (former), National Guard (current)*
  - *01262022_AHB: Air Force (current)*

[123] This includes army national guard, air national guard, and any state national guard (Ex: Texas national guard)
[124] Military police (MPs) should be listed by their military branch and not coded as 'police'
[125] If service classification is unavailable, note in the short narrative how it is known they served in the military. For example "They were a Gulf War Veteran"

68) CITIZENSHIP STATUS What citizenship status does the defendant hold in the US?[126],[127]

a) U.S. citizen[128, 129]
   i) This includes individuals with dual citizenship[130]
b) U.S. permanent resident
c) Residing in U.S. on visa
d) Residing in U.S. as refugee
e) Foreign national *(i.e., citizen of a non-U.S. country)*
f) Unknown

69) TAGS This variable is an open response variable used to track related cases. In order to code it, **you must review all of the preexisting tags** in the tPP Tag/Group Affiliation Library and see if ***any* of the tags** should be added, separated by a comma. You MUST copy and paste tags DIRECTLY from the library document into the spreadsheet. More than one tag can be used for a case. Please separate tags with a comma and a space, and if there are three or more tags, do NOT use the word 'and'. For example, if a case warranted having the following tags: 'SovereignCitizen', 'January6CapitolProtest', and 'MisdemeanorOnly', in the spreadsheet this would be coded as: SovereignCitizen, January6CapitolProtest, MisdemeanorOnly. New tags can be offered at monthly meetings for discussion ***before*** addition.

70) SHORT NARRATIVE Please provide a short narrative of the case which provides the reader with enough information that they can understand why the case is included, what transpired, and the basic facts of the defendant's prosecution. Make sure to include the defendants' name(s), motive, means, target and a summary of the charges. Aim to include the 'who, what, when, where and why' of the case in a short paragraph of approximately 4 sentences.

- A general template: In **YEAR**, in **CITY/PLACE, NAME, AGE,** was charged with **CHARGES** / convicted with CHARGES. This was carried out through TACTIC which targeted TARGET and was motivated by MOTIVE.
- The narrative is precisely the time to NOT use values such as 'other', 'multiple', 'various', etc. Those values are used in validated cells. Here, specifics should be used. For example, 'multiple' should be explained as 'two buildings were targeted with arson and a third with graffiti vandalism',' etc.

---

[126] The purpose of this variable is to determine what rights and protections the defendant is entitled to in the US.
[127] In the instance that an individual is denaturalized, code for their original citizenship prior to denaturalization and note the denaturalization in the "additional sentencing" variable.
[128] If information on the individual's citizenship status is not referenced in news sources and/or court proceedings, the default status of the individual can be presumed as "U.S. citizen."
[129] US citizens include US nationals from American Samoa and Swains Island, see: https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/5026/text
[130] US Naturalization Processes: https://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/educators/naturalization-information
US Naturalization Oath: https://www.uscis.gov/us-citizenship/naturalization-test/naturalization-oath-allegiance-united-states-america

71) NAME OF CODER(S) What are the names of the individuals who coded this case?
- Separate names with a comma

72) SOURCE DESCRIPTION From what source(s) did you draw your information? (include all sources that are saved in 'source files' separated by a coma.)
  a) Charging documents (Indictment, Criminal Complaint, Criminal Information, Affidavit, Arrest Warrant)
  b) Court documents (Plea Agreement, Sentencing Memorandum, Judgements, Dockets, PACER summary, Motions, Orders, Petition, Arrest record, Docket)
  c) News articles (national/international)
  d) Local news articles
  e) State Government Offices (State District Attorney Office, State Courts, State/Municipal Police/Sheriff Reports)
  f) Governmental reports and release: FBI, OPA, ICE, DOJ
  g) Databases
  h) Any scraped database or dataset
  i) Academic articles
  j) Books
  k) Other
  l) Email, Newsletter, Social Media

73) AUDITED Has the case been audited?

74) DATE OF LAST REVIEW Automated; tracks the most recent date of revision for the case.

75) CASE STARTER READY Is the case starter complete and ready to be coded?

76) CLAIMED Is the case currently being coded by someone?

77) COMPLETED Is the case fully coded and ready for migration?

78) QUESTIONABLE INCLUSION Is the inclusion of the case questionable based on the project's outlined inclusion criteria?

Appendix

Communication Event Example

In the example below, drawn from 02062025_FMN, we see that the defendant tweeted multiple threatening posts in rapid succession. If this screenshot from an official court document was the only form of threat/harassment the defendant engaged in, we would code variable **8) Frequency** as “low”. If, however, the defendant’s tweets shown in this image were spaced multiple hours, days, weeks, etc. apart, we would code “medium” because there are four tweets shown.